
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

1986

The Interaction Effects of Organizational Structure and Organizational Type on Managerial Job Satisfaction

Robert W. Adams
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Adams, Robert W., "The Interaction Effects of Organizational Structure and Organizational Type on Managerial Job Satisfaction" (1986). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 4869.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd/4869>

THE INTERACTION EFFECTS
OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE
ON MANAGERIAL JOB SATISFACTION

BY

ROBERT WOODROW ADAMS
B.S., University of Georgia, 1977

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Science degree in Industrial Psychology
in the Graduate Studies Program
of the College of Arts and Sciences
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
1986

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my parents - Jesse and Sybil, for their special love and encouragement and the rest of my family - Suzy, Bill, Bud, and Michele.

A special thank you to Richard, Nancy, Katie, and Julie Bagby.

Thank you to the following:

Dr. Ed Shirkey for his guidance,

Dr. Wayne Burroughs and Dr. Janet Turnage for their invaluable assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Organization Structure and Job Satisfaction	4
Organization Type and Job Satisfaction	8
Summary	13
METHODS	20
Subjects	20
Apparatus	22
Procedure	24
RESULTS	26
DISCUSSION	43
APPENDIX A	52
APPENDIX B	53
APPENDIX C	54
APPENDIX D	58
REFERENCES	59

INTRODUCTION

Organizational structure can be viewed as the distribution of units and positions within an organization and their subsequent relationships to each other (James & Jones, 1976). Most researchers, however, fail to agree on a common definition of this concept. From an examination of the literature, there are generally two approaches employed to characterize organizational structure -- the subsystem approach and descriptive approach. The subsystem or substructure approach differentiates substructures on the basis of events, processes, or decision-making responsibilities. Katz and Kahn (1966) postulated that structure develops because of the need for cooperation among organizational units. Parsons (1960) viewed organizations as being comprised of separate substructures based upon different levels of responsibility and control. In addition, Litwak (1961) questioned the existence of an overall organizational structure because the different departments, divisions, and groups within organizations perform different functions. Assuming that structure is a function of events, Litwak explains that the different departments should then have different structures.

In contrast to the subsystem approach, the descriptive approach is primarily concerned with the overall organizational characteristics which span across departments (e.g., the degree to which several or all departments are organized into a tall versus a flat configuration). Several authors have focused on the measurement of overall organizational variables such as size, span of control, and the number of hierarchical levels (Indik, 1968; Porter & Lawler, 1965; Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, & Turner, 1968; Sells, 1963). Although several of these authors have differentiated between overall organization structure and various subsystems, there is an implied consensus that an overall organization structure exists.

Several authors have presented relevant variables or dimensions of descriptive organizational structure (Indik, 1968; Porter & Lawler, 1964; Pugh et al., 1968; Sells, 1963; Worthy, 1950). Sells (1963) defined the following structural measures:

- (a) size;
- (b) differentiation by subgroups and levels;
- (c) autonomy with respect to outside control and support;
- (d) control; and
- (e) role structure.

Indik (1968) included the following variables in his description of organization structure:

- (a) size;
- (b) span of control;
- (c) number of hierarchical levels;
- (d) authority structure;
- (e) communication structure;
- (f) degree of task interdependence;
- (g) degree of specialization;
- (h) task specialization;
- (i) status and prestige structure; and
- (j) psychological distance between decision makers and operating levels in the organization.

Pugh et al. (1968) identified six primary dimensions of organization structure:

- (1) specialization;
- (2) standardization;
- (3) formalization;
- (4) centralization;
- (5) configuration; and
- (6) flexibility.

Porter and Lawler (1964) examined both total and suborganizational structural properties. The total organization properties were size, shape (tall or flat), and centralization, while the suborganizational properties were

organization level, line and staff hierarchies, span of control, and size of subunits.

Organization Structure and Job Satisfaction

There have been relatively few studies conducted that have examined the relationship between organization structure (tall/flat) and job satisfaction. Not until 1962 was any empirical research generated on this topic in the literature. Perhaps the first important study in this particular area was Worthy's (1950) study of approximately 100,000 employees of Sears, Roebuck, and Company over a twelve-year period. Although there was no empirical evidence given, this study was the most widely publicized of its time and the most often cited by researchers. Worthy defined tall organizations as those with many managerial levels relative to its size, and a flat organization as one that has few levels relative to its size. Worthy's major conclusion was that tall organizations, because of a proliferation of hierarchical levels of management, tend to encourage low employee morale, suppression of personal judgement, and low job autonomy. He concluded that flatter, less complex organizations tend to create a potential for improved attitudes, greater individual responsibility, and

initiative among employees. In addition, these flatter structures encourage the development of self-expression and creativity which are necessary to the satisfaction of employees. Worthy's study is often cited as evidence of the superiority of flat over tall organization structure.

A case study of managers by Richardson and Walker (1948) is often referred to in support of Worthy's conclusions. In their study, several levels of administrators were eliminated from a company over a period of time. During this time, the size of the company doubled without adverse effects on the morale of the employees. The results tend to support the superiority of flat organizational structure.

Carpenter (1971) compared tall, medium, and flat structures in public school systems in relation to job satisfaction of teachers. He found that public school teachers in flat organizations perceived higher job satisfaction than teachers in medium and tall organizations. In an earlier paper, Carpenter (1970) concluded that the more administrative levels which exist between the superintendent's position and that of the classroom teacher, the lower the perceived satisfaction level of the teacher. Increasing the number of administrative levels and positions appears to adversely affect several areas considered important to professional job satisfaction.

Ivancevich and Donnelly (1975) found that 295 trade salesmen in flat organizations perceived more self-actualization and autonomy satisfaction than their counterparts in tall organizations. In addition, the subjects in flat organizations reported significantly lower amounts of anxiety-stress than subjects in tall organizations as measured by a nine-item scale developed by Kahn (1964).

Ghiselli and Johnson (1970) measured need satisfaction of managers in tall and flat organizations. The 413 managers represented a wide variety of businesses throughout the United States. They found that successful managers in flat organizations demonstrated significant differences when compared to those in tall organizations in terms of satisfaction of higher-order needs. Successful managers in flat organizations perceived higher need satisfaction for esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. Other authors also present cases for the superiority of flat over tall organizational structures (Alder, 1978; Wesolowski, 1970).

Despite these findings in favor of flat over tall organizations in producing higher need satisfaction, other research has shown either no differences or has favored tall organization structure (Cummings & Berger, 1977; Ghiselli & Siegel, 1972; Meltzer & Salter, 1962; Porter & Lawler, 1964;

Porter & Siegel, 1965). Meltzer and Salter (1962) failed to show any attitude differences between employees working in flat versus tall organizations. When holding size of organization constant, the relationship of number of levels to satisfaction was not statistically significant.

Porter and Lawler (1964) investigated the relation of tall versus flat types of structure to managerial job satisfaction. Their findings showed no overall superiority of flat over tall organizations in producing greater need satisfaction for managers. However, organization size seemed to have some effect on the relative effectiveness of flat versus tall structures. In companies of less than 5,000 employees, managerial satisfaction was greater in flat structured organizations. Porter and Siegel (1965) confirm these conclusions. They explained that in a small organization, problems of coordination and communication are not complex because the organization is, in fact, small. Therefore, a tall structure which allows superiors to coordinate and communicate more effectively would not be advantageous. A tall structure imposed on a small organization could be harmful rather than helpful when considering managerial satisfaction.

Finally, Cummings and Berger (1977) state that in respect to levels, high-level executives in tall organizations and lower-level executives in flat organizations

experience more satisfaction than their opposites. Theirs was the first study to examine the moderating effect of managerial level on the relationship between organization structure and job satisfaction.

Organization Type and Job Satisfaction

Another research area of interest involves the relationship between organization type and job satisfaction. Many attempts have been made over the years to classify organizations into typologies. Because of the diverse characteristics inherent in formal organizations, many different schemes have been proposed. Most typologies of organizations have utilized single criteria such as size (Kimberly, 1976), technology (Woodward, 1958), control systems (Etzioni, 1964), and prime beneficiaries (Blau & Scott, 1962). Filley and Aldag (1978) derived one such organization typology based upon three strategies for organizing and for dealing with the environment. Other typologies have been based upon genotypic functions, and are concerned with the nature of the work that gets done (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Parsons, 1960).

In general, it would seem that organizations may be classified by profiles of characteristics or by single

traits. It is possible that these methods of classification of organization types could have predictive and normative value.

Woodward (1958) devised a classification scheme based on the technology employed by each firm. Organizations were grouped into three main categories of technological process: unit (e.g., producing units on customer's orders), mass (e.g., assembly lines), process (e.g., continuous flow production). Filley and Aldag's (1975) typology is based upon three strategies for organizing and for dealing with the environment. The types were identified as craft, promotion, and administrative. A craft organization is one influenced by management concerned with comfort and survival objectives and engaged in technical rather than administrative duties. A promotion organization is one that is innovative and directed by management that is promotion oriented. The administrative organization is characterized by professional and competitive management. The key point illustrated by these studies is that classification by a single criterion such as size or technology may not completely distinguish between organizations.

Katz and Kahn (1978) postulated that organizations fall into four main classes based upon their relative role or function in society. These classes are productive, maintenance, adaptive, and managerial. Productive or

economic organizations are concerned with providing goods and services. Maintenance organizations are concerned with the socialization of people. Managerial organizations have to do with the coordination of people and resources. Adaptive organizations are those which create new knowledge and provide innovative solutions to problems. Although these types of organizations are intended to be independent of each other, the researchers pointed out that some organizations take on two or more functions. They also suggested that organizational subsystems represent genotypic functions. For example, productive organizations turn out products or services but still have their own mechanisms for maintenance, management, and adaptation.

The Parsons' (1960) typology was concerned with the link between an organization and the society it operates within. He distinguished four types of organizations according to what they contribute to society. The first is the production organization. This type of organization makes things that are consumed by the society. The second type is the political organization which strives to insure that society attain its valued goals. The third type is the integrative organization. The purpose of this type of organization is to settle conflict and insure that the parts of society work together. The final type is the pattern maintenance organization which provides educational and

cultural activities. This particular typology has undergone much criticism in the literature. Perrow (1967) stated the Parsons' typology does not differentiate between the characteristics of organizations themselves. He concluded that there can be as much variation within such types as between them. For example, a production organization not only makes consumer goods but could also perform integrative, political, and pattern maintenance functions for society.

Etzioni (1964) used compliance as a typological basis. The compliance structure is formed by the kind of power applied by the organization to the lower level employees. In addition, the kinds of involvement in the organization developed by the lower level participants help form this structure, according to Etzioni. Three main organizational types were found: coercive, utilitarian, and normative. Coercive organizations are those which use coercion as the chief means of control over lower-level employees. These employees tend to become alienated toward the organization. Utilitarian organizations use remuneration as the basis for control; with the employees providing services in exchange for monetary rewards. Normative organizations use moral controls over lower-level employees who have a positive orientation toward the organization. It must be

said, however, that Etzioni suggested the use of mixed types when classifying organizations (1964).

Blau and Scott (1962) classified organizations on the basis of cui bono or who benefits. They distinguished between four basic categories of persons in relation to any formal organization:

- (1) the members or rank-and-file participants;
- (2) the owners or managers of the organization;
- (3) the clients or the "public-in-contact"; and
- (4) the "public-at-large," that is, the members of the society in which the organization operates.

The concept of cui bono asks the question: "Which of these four categories is the prime beneficiary of their operations?" Four types of organizations result from the application of the cui bono criterion:

- (1) mutual-benefit associations (e.g., co-operative, union), where the prime beneficiary is the membership;
- (2) service organizations (e.g., civil rights organization), where the prime beneficiary is the client group;
- (3) business organizations (e.g., manufacturing plant), where the owners are the prime beneficiary; and

- (4) commonweal organizations (e.g., public television station), where the prime beneficiary is the public at large.

The main difference between Blau and Scott's (1962) typology and the Etzioni (1964) typology is that the Blau-Scott approach has the organization as the dependent variable. The Etzioni approach has organizations as the independent variable with the control structure as the dependent variable. Etzioni places great importance on control systems as a basis for distinguishing among different types of organizations.

Studies measuring employee attitudes in different types of organizations have not been numerous. There have been comparisons between profit-nonprofit, governmental-nongovernmental, and public-private organizations (Grupp & Richards, 1975; Kilpatrick, 1964). However, studies which have utilized typologies in measuring attitudes have been quite few (Meyer, 1977).

Summary

From this brief review of the literature it is apparent that research in general has failed to confirm the idea that one organizational shape is superior to another.

Therefore, the current investigation attempted to clarify the question of the superiority of tall versus flat organization structure on managerial job satisfaction. Since the investigation was concerned with dimensions of total organization structure there was an attempt to use the descriptive approach to characterize organizational variables. It examined Porter and Lawler's (1964) and Worthy's (1950) dimension of organization shape: the tall versus flat configuration of organizations and its relationship to the job satisfaction of managerial personnel. Tall organizations were defined as those with many levels of management while flat organizations were defined as those with few levels of management. Since organization size and managerial level have been shown to moderate the effects of previous studies, there was an attempt to control for size and for managerial level in this study. Hulin and Smith (1964) stated that high job levels and the higher wages that go with these jobs generally contribute to higher job satisfaction. It is, therefore, important to maintain job level as a constant to minimize the differences in job satisfaction that might be found from surveying individuals from many different managerial levels.

From the previous research conducted on this subject, it is possible to propose that flat organizations provide an opportunity for satisfaction of higher-order needs or the

intangible aspects of work while tall organizations provide an opportunity for satisfaction of lower order needs or the tangible aspects of work.

This investigation examined and contrasted two of Blau and Scott's (1962) types of organizations, specifically the business organization and the commonweal organization. These types were compared to one another in relation to the job satisfaction of managerial personnel. The reason this particular typology was chosen over other typologies is its practicality and its greater capacity to distinguish between the different types of organizations it proposes. It was expected that there would be differences in job satisfaction among managers within the two types. This investigation is the first one that has attempted to measure job satisfaction while utilizing such a typology. People, in general, are believed to be attracted to and work for organizations based upon their personal goals in life. Different types of organizations, also, should have objectives and goals that they attempt to accomplish. If personal goals and organizational goals mesh, then there exists a satisfying relationship. Likewise, it is suggested that business and commonweal organizations lead to employee satisfaction with different aspects of their work. Because of their service to the public orientation, commonweal organizations should lead to greater job satisfaction with

the intangible aspects of work such as company identification and the kind of work performed. Business organizations, because of their profit orientation, are believed to lead to greater job satisfaction with the more tangible aspects of work such as pay and physical conditions.

One criticism of the previous job satisfaction studies dealing with organization structure and type is the apparent lack of inquiry into the interaction effects of these two variables. One variable, i.e., organization type, could possibly moderate the effects of the other variable, i.e., organization structure, on job satisfaction. Therefore, the final objective of this study is to examine the interaction effects of organizational structure (tall/flat) and organizational type (business/commonweal) on managerial job satisfaction. Several authors have suggested this type of investigation. Porter and Lawler (1964) stated that "future research will undoubtedly show that other variables such as type of company will have an important bearing on which type of structure is more advantageous in terms of job attitudes and job performance" (p. 148). Worthy (1959) has pointed out that different degrees of flatness may be desirable depending upon the type of organization considered. In 1977 Meyer wrote, "There is a need to study whether profit organizations are more innovative, humane, responsive, and

so forth than organizations which do not seek profit" (p. 86). Although these authors have commented on the need for such an investigation, there have been no empirical studies undertaken to examine the interaction of organization structure and type. This particular study will attempt to examine such an interaction. It is believed that different types of organizations need to be structured in such a way as to maximize employee job satisfaction.

The purpose of the present study is to examine the following hypotheses:

1. First-level managers in flat organizations will exhibit significant differences in job satisfaction when compared to first-level managers in tall organizations.
 - (a) If the organization structure is flat, first level managers will be more satisfied with their co-workers, kind of work, company identification, and supervision than first level managers in tall organizations.
 - (b) If the organization structure is tall, first level managers will be more satisfied with the physical conditions of work, amount of work, career future, and the financial aspect of their job than first-level managers in flat organizations.

2. First-level managers in business organizations will exhibit significant differences in job satisfaction when compared to first-level managers in commonweal organizations.
 - (a) First-level managers in business type organizations will be more satisfied with the amount of work, physical conditions of work, career future, and financial aspects of work than first-level managers in commonweal type organizations.
 - (b) First-level managers in commonweal type organizations will be more satisfied with the kind of work, co-workers, company identification, and supervision than first-level managers in business organizations.
3. There will be a significant interaction effect between organizational structure (tall/flat) and organizational type (business/commonweal) on job satisfaction of first-level managers. It is expected that managers in tall business and in flat commonweal organizations will be more satisfied than their counterparts in flat business and tall commonweal organizations.

- (a) First-level managers in tall business organizations will be more satisfied than first-level managers in flat commonweal organizations when considering the physical conditions of work, amount of work, career future, and financial aspects of their jobs.
- (b) First-level managers in flat commonweal organizations will be more satisfied than first-level managers in tall business organizations when considering their kind of work, co-workers, company identification, and supervision.

In conclusion, the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction and the relationship between organizational type and job satisfaction were examined in this study. The configurational dimensions of tall versus flat organizational structure were the levels of one factor. Blau and Scott's (1962) classifications of business versus commonweal organizations were the levels of the other factor. Finally, the interaction effect of these levels of organizational structure and type were examined in relation to job satisfaction.

METHODS

Subjects

The subjects were 80 first-level managers or supervisory personnel employed at eight separate organizations all located in the Central Florida area. Ten managers from each organization were surveyed and were randomly chosen to control for extraneous variables. There were a total of 61 males and 19 females in the sample. The groups of managers consisted of the following combinations:

- (1) 20 subjects from two tall business organizations
 - Airline - Employees = 5,000; Levels = 9
 - Manufacturer - Employees = 1,100; Levels = 7
- (2) 20 subjects from two flat business organizations
 - Oil and Gas - Employees = 620; Levels = 4
 - Bank - Employees = 80; Levels = 3
- (3) 20 subjects from two tall commonweal organizations
 - City Fire Dept.- Employees = 500; Levels = 10
 - State Health Dept.- Employees = 350; Levels = 8

(4) 20 subjects from two flat commonweal organizations

- County Services - Employees = 600; Levels = 4
- Public TV Station - Employees = 80; Levels = 3

Organizations were classified as business and commonweal types according to the Blau and Scott (1962) typology referred to in Appendix A. Tall and flat structural configurations (total number of employees and number of managerial levels) were based upon a study by Porter and Lawler (1964) referred to in Appendix B.

The eight organizations were chosen through investigative efforts. Information was gathered via interviews and examination of organization structural charts. In the organizational selection process close conformation to the Blau and Scott (1962) typology and Porter and Lawler (1964) structural classification was ensured. This effort guaranteed the presence of discernable differences in organization type and structure.

For the purpose of controlling several of those factors that tend to distort measures of job satisfaction, organizations which were believed to strongly exhibit those factors were not considered for this study. According to

the literature, those factors which contribute most to low employee job satisfaction are as follows:

- (1) low pay (Lawler, 1971; Milbourn, 1980);
- (2) low employee self-esteem (Lawler, 1971; McLean, 1975);
- (3) high role conflict/ambiguity (Keller, 1975; Valenzi & Dessler, 1978); and
- (4) autocratic managerial style (Seashore & Bowers, 1970; Valenzi & Dessler, 1978); and
- (5) high degree of formalization (Dewar & Werbel, 1979).

The determination of organizational characteristics was based on the expert opinion of several leading practitioners in the personnel, training, and human resource management fields. Organizations which participated in this study were believed by these practitioners not to strongly exhibit any of the five factors.

Apparatus

The Index of Organizational Reactions (IOR) (Smith, 1962; 1976) was used as a measure of managerial job satisfaction (see Appendix C). The IOR consists of eight scales

containing a total of 42 items. The scales include supervision (items 1-6), kind of work (items 7-12), amount of work (items 13-16), co-workers (items 17-21), pay (items 22-26), physical conditions of work (items 27-32), career future (items 33-37), and company identification (items 38-42). Each scale contains from four to six five-choice items. In a 1977 study, Smith, Dunham, and Blackburn demonstrated that the IOR met adequate criteria for good measures of job satisfaction. The IOR scales were shown to demonstrate excellent discriminant and convergent validity when utilizing the multitrait-multimethod matrix. In their analysis, Smith et al. (1977) concluded that the IOR provided the second highest convergent validity (.59) when compared to the MSQ (.63), JDI (.47), and Faces (.56) scales. The most stringent discriminant validity criterion was met by the IOR when compared to the other methods. This criterion requires that the convergent validity of each trait exceed the correlations between the trait and other traits measured with the same method. This test of discriminant validity is met in 77 percent of the cases for IOR method, 70 percent of the MSQ cases, and 55 percent of the cases for both the Faces and JDI. The IOR scales were shown to produce almost identical factorial structure across

five different samples of workers and across time. These findings suggest that the scales are flexible and can be used with a wide range of persons from a wide range of jobs. The scales have been successfully used on employees ranging from unskilled workers to top-level executives.

Procedure

The independent variables in this study were the levels of organization structure (tall/flat) and type (business/commonweal) while the dependent variables were the measures of job satisfaction obtained from the eight IOR scales (pay, amount of work, physical conditions, career future, kind of work, supervision, co-workers, and company identification). The first-level managers surveyed in the study were contacted by their Personnel office and asked to complete the scales individually and privately. A personnel representative distributed the questionnaires to the managers through interoffice mail. A foreword was included with each questionnaire which briefly explained the purpose of the investigation (see Appendix D). The subjects were also assured of anonymity by requesting them to designate

only their position title. Once completed, each questionnaire was returned to the personnel representative, who forwarded them through the mail to the researcher for analysis.

As indicated by Porter and Lawler (1964), size seems to have some influence on the effectiveness of different kinds of organizational structure. Therefore, by using a ratio of number of managerial levels to total organization size, the variable of size was controlled. Managerial level was held constant to control for the moderating effects that differing managerial levels have on job satisfaction (Cummings & Berger, 1977; Hulin & Smith, 1964).

RESULTS

Scores on the eight scales of the Index of Organization Reaction (IOR) were calculated for each first level manager in the study. The subjects were grouped into a 2 x 2 factorial design. The two factors comprising the independent variable of organization structure were tall and flat while the two factors comprising the independent variable of organization type were business and commonweal. The resulting data were analyzed by an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure. In this analysis, the main effects of organization structure alone and organization type alone were investigated as well as the interaction effects between the two variables.

Tables 1-8 give the results of the eight 2 x 2 ANOVAs testing hypotheses 1(a,b), 2(a,b), and 3(a,b). Tables 1a-8a present the means and standard deviations for each of the two variables (organization structure - tall versus flat and organization type - business versus commonweal) across the eight scales of the IOR. Higher mean scores represent greater job satisfaction.

Examining Hypothesis 1 (a,b), the main effects of organization structure (tall versus flat) was found to be significant for Supervision, $F(1,76) = 7.07, p < .01$; and Co-workers, $F(1,76) = 4.94, p < .05$; and not significant for Kind of Work, $F(1,76) = .02, p > .05$; Company Identification, $F(1,76) = 1.31, p > .05$; Pay, $F(1,76) = .18, p > .05$; Physical Conditions, $F(1,76) = 1.63, p > .05$; Amount of Work, $F(1,76) = 3.42, p > .05$; and Career Future, $F(1,76) = .23, p > .05$. On the Supervision scale, the mean for the tall organization group was $X = 21.60$ and the mean for the flat organization group was $X = 23.90$. On the Co-workers scale, the mean for the tall organization group was $X = 18.90$ and the mean for the flat organization group was $X = 20.30$.

Examining Hypothesis 2 (a,b), the main effects of organization type (business versus commonweal) was found to be significant for Company Identification, $F(1,76) = 11.82, p < .01$; Pay, $F(1,76) = 48.10, p < .01$; and Amount of Work, $F(1,76) = 4.28, p < .05$; and not significant for Supervision, $F(1,76) = 2.66, p > .05$; Kind of Work, $F(1,76) = 1.11, p > .05$; Co-workers, $F(1,76) = .02, p > .05$; Physical Conditions, $F(1,76) = 3.99, p > .05$; and Career Future, $F(1,76) = 2.07, p > .05$. On the Company Identification scale the mean for the business organization

group was $X = 18.90$ and the mean for the commonweal organization group was $X = 16.00$. On the Pay scale the mean for the business organization group was $X = 18.70$ and the mean for the commonweal organization group was $X = 13.50$. On the Amount of Work scale the mean for the business organization group was $X = 14.90$ and the mean for the commonweal organization group was $X = 13.40$.

Examining Hypothesis 3 (a,b), the interaction effects of organization structure and organization type were not found to be significant for Supervision, $F(1,76) = 1.96$, $p > .05$; Kind of Work, $F(1,76) = 2.54$, $p > .05$; Co-workers, $F(1,76) = .006$, $p > .05$; Company Identification, $F(1,76) = 1.16$, $p > .05$; Pay, $F(1,76) = 2.38$, $p > .05$; Physical Conditions, $F(1,76) = 1.29$, $p > .05$; Amount of Work, $F(1,76) = .22$, $p > .05$; and Career Future, $F(1,76) = 3.32$, $p > .05$.

In addition to the analysis above, which examined each separate scale of the IOR, a further analysis was conducted to determine relationships among the scales of the IOR. A principle components analysis with varimax rotation of the correlations among the eight IOR scales was conducted to examine the underlying factors which may account for the observed relationships among them. Table 9 gives the

TABLE 1
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR SUPERVISION SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	108.113	1	108.113	7.07**
Organization Type	40.613	1	40.613	2.66
Interaction	30.012	1	30.012	1.96
Error	1,161.450	76	15.282	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 1A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
SUPERVISION SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	21.55	21.75	21.60
	SD 3.42	SD 4.76	
Flat	22.65	25.30	23.90
	SD 4.14	SD 3.15	
Total	22.10	23.50	

TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR KIND OF WORK SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	.32	1	.32	.02
Organization Type	19.02	1	19.02	1.11
Interaction	43.51	1	43.51	2.54
Error	1,303.65	76	17.15	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 2A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
KIND OF WORK SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	23.95 SD 3.79	23.45 SD 3.12	23.70
Flat	25.25 SD 5.39	24.80 SD 4.23	25.00
Total	24.60	24.10	

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR CO-WORKERS SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	39.20	1	39.20	4.94*
Organization Type	.20	1	.20	.02
Interaction	.05	1	.05	.006
Error	603.30	76	7.94	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 3A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
CO-WORKERS SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	19.00	18.85	18.90
	SD 2.50	SD 3.85	
Flat	20.35	20.30	20.30
	SD 2.64	SD 2.70	
Total	19.60	19.50	

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR COMPANY IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	13.61	1	13.61	1.31
Organization Type	122.51	1	122.51	11.82**
Interaction	12.01	1	12.02	1.16
Error	787.36	76	10.36	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 4A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
COMPANY IDENTIFICATION SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	18.95	15.70	17.30
	SD 2.28	SD 4.29	
Flat	19.00	16.35	17.60
	SD 2.95	SD 4.10	
Total	18.90	16.00	

TABLE 5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR PAY SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	2.11	1	2.11	.18
Organization Type	556.51	1	556.51	48.10**
Interaction	27.62	1	27.62	2.38
Error	879.25	76	11.57	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 5A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
PAY SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	19.20 SD 2.33	12.75 SD 4.30	15.90
Flat	18.35 SD 2.39	14.25 SD 4.09	16.30
Total	18.70	13.50	

TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR PHYSICAL CONDITIONS SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	37.81	1	37.81	1.63
Organization Type	90.31	1	90.31	3.89
Interaction	30.02	1	30.02	1.29
Error	1,761.25	76	23.17	

*p <.05
**p <.01

TABLE 6A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	23.40 SD 3.10	20.05 SD 5.69	21.70
Flat	23.55 SD 3.26	22.65 SD 5.56	23.10
Total	23.47	21.35	

TABLE 7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR AMOUNT OF WORK SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	32.51	1	32.51	3.42
Organization Type	40.61	1	40.61	4.28*
Interaction	2.12	1	2.12	.22
Error	720.95	76	9.49	

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 7A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
AMOUNT OF WORK SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	15.70	13.95	14.80
SD	3.36	SD 3.34	
Flat	14.10	13.00	13.50
SD	2.79	SD 2.86	
Total	14.90	13.40	

TABLE 8
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR IOR CAREER FUTURE SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	2.81	1	2.81	.23
Organization Type	25.31	1	25.31	2.07
Interaction	40.62	1	40.62	3.32
Error	929.95	76	12.24	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 8A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IOR
CAREER FUTURE SCALE

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	20.15	17.60	18.80
SD	2.25	5.24	
Flat	19.10	19.40	19.20
SD	3.14	2.55	
Total	19.60	18.50	

Correlation Matrix for the eight IOR variables. The matrix shows significant correlations among the scales of the IOR. The principle components analysis procedure identified two factors named Intangible and Tangible. The Intangible factor was determined primarily by the IOR scales of Supervision, Kind of Work, and Co-workers. The Tangible factor was determined primarily by the IOR scales of Amount of Work and Pay. The resulting rotated factor matrix, along with Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance, are presented in Table 10. These factors were labeled for the purposes of this investigation. The first factor was named "Intangible job satisfaction" and the second factor was named "Tangible job satisfaction."

Two Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedures were employed to further investigate the main effects of organization structure and organization type on the two component scores. The two 2 x 2 ANOVAs examining these effects are presented in tables 11 and 12. The resulting group means are given in tables 11a and 12a. Examining Table 11, the main effects of organization structure (tall versus flat) was found to be significant for Factor 1, $F(1,76) = 6.09$, $p < .05$. The mean for the tall organization

TABLE 9
FACTOR ANALYSIS CORRELATION MATRIX

	SPV	KOW	AOW	CW	PAY	PHC	CRF	COI
SPV	1.00							
KOW	.46	1.00						
AOW	.18	.21	1.00					
CW	.41	.22	.12	1.00				
PAY	.23	.14	.38	.16	1.00			
PHC	.22	.42	.21	.26	.32	1.00		
CRF	.46	.44	.39	.30	.47	.29	1.00	
COI	.50	.40	.26	.31	.65	.40	.64	1.00

SPV-SUPERVISION
 KOW-KIND OF WORK
 AOW-AMOUNT OF WORK
 CW-COWORKERS
 PAY-PAY
 PHC-PHYSICAL CONDITIONS
 CRF-CAREER FUTURE
 COI-COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

TABLE 10
 ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX AND FINAL STATISTICS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	COMMUNALITIES
SPV	.78	.16	.63
KOW	.73	.15	.55
AOW	.02	.70	.48
CW	.68	.02	.46
PAY	.09	.86	.75
PHC	.48	.34	.34
CRF	.50	.63	.64
COI	.51	.67	.72
EIGENVALUE	3.45	1.12	
PCT OF VAR	43.20	14.10	

SPV-SUPERVISION
 KOW-KIND OF WORK
 AOW-AMOUNT OF WORK
 CW-COWORKERS
 PAY-PAY
 PHC-PHYSICAL CONDITIONS
 CRF-CAREER FUTURE
 COI-COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

TABLE 11
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTOR 1 (INTANGIBLE)

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	540.60	1	540.60	6.09*
Organization Type	249.90	1	249.90	2.82
Interaction	190.95	1	190.95	2.15
Error	6,744.55	76	88.70	

** p < .01
* p < .05

TABLE 11A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
FACTOR 1 (INTANGIBLE)

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	47.38	47.75	47.57
SD	8.70	SD 12.40	
Flat	49.43	56.06	52.74
SD	8.57	SD 7.22	
Total	48.40	51.90	

TABLE 12
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTOR 2 (TANGIBLE)

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Organization Structure	78.00	1	78.00	1.15
Organization Type	2,590.13	1	2,590.13	38.38**
Interaction	138.61	1	138.61	2.05
Error	5,129.06	76	67.48	

** p < .01
* p < .05

TABLE 12A
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
FACTOR 2 (TANGIBLE)

	Business	Commonweal	Total
Tall	57.98 SD 7.31	44.04 SD 9.06	51.01
Flat	53.45 SD 6.14	44.62 SD 9.40	49.03
Total	55.71	44.33	

group was $X = 47.57$ and the mean for the flat organization group was $X = 52.74$. The main effects of organization type (business versus commonweal) was found not to be significant, $F(1,76) = 2.82$, $p > .05$ and the interaction effects of structure and type was found not to be significant, $F(1,76) = 2.15$, $p > .05$. Examining Table 12, the main effects of organization type was found to be significant for Factor 2, $F(1,76) = 38.38$, $p < .01$. The mean for the commonweal group was $X = 44.33$ and the mean for the business group was $X = 55.71$. The main effects of organization structure was found not to be significant, $F(1,76) = 1.15$, $p > .05$ and the interaction effects of type and structure was found not to be significant, $F(1,76) = 2.05$, $p > .05$.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the effects of organization structure (tall versus flat) and organization type (business versus commonweal) on job satisfaction of first level managers in eight local organizations. In general, the following conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study:

- (1) The hypothesis of a significant difference in job satisfaction among first-level managers in flat organizations and first-level managers in tall organizations was partially supported.
- (2) The hypothesis of a significant difference in job satisfaction among first-level managers in commonweal organizations and first-level managers in business organizations was partially supported.
- (3) The hypothesis of a significant interaction effect between organization structure and organization type on job satisfaction of first-level managers was not supported.

Considering Hypothesis 1, there were significant differences for the scales of Co-Workers and Supervision.

Both measures of satisfaction were, as predicted, higher for the flat structured organizations. No significant differences were shown for the remaining scales of the IOR (Pay, Amount of Work, Physical Conditions, Career Future, Company Identification, and Kind of Work). Managers in flat structured organizations were more satisfied with their co-workers and their supervisors than were managers in tall organizations. These results may indicate that, of those factors measured in this study, the only factors affected by the number of managerial levels within the organizations were these two less tangible factors. In other words, while a flat structure may provide less opportunities for interaction with an immediate supervisor, the interaction may be of a higher quality. Also the flatter structure may provide more opportunities for communication and exchange of ideas between managers and their peers or co-workers. In addition, the flatter structure may offer managers more opportunities for direct contact with upper management providing the managers with a feeling of buy-in and commitment to the organization resulting in greater satisfaction with this aspect of their jobs. These findings were consistent with those of Carpenter (1971) and Richardson and Walker (1948) who found that flatter organizations created potential for improved attitudes, greater self-expression, and higher morale.

The results showing no significant differences on the remaining scales may point to the possibility that satisfaction with these aspects of a job is dependent on more than structural characteristics of the organization. For example, satisfaction with Kind of Work may be less dependent on the structure of the organization than on other characteristics of the organization (e.g., climate).

Considering Hypothesis 2, there were significant differences for the scales of Pay, Amount of Work, and Company Identification. No significant differences were shown for the remaining scales of the IOR (Supervision, Co-Workers, Kind of Work, Career Future, and Physical Conditions). As predicted, managers in business organizations were more satisfied with their pay and amount of work than were managers in commonweal organizations. These results suggest that these more tangible factors are significantly affected by the organization type or who benefits from the organization. For example, in most profit-making organizations salary or bonus is tied directly to success of the operation. In most commonweal organizations, salary is fixed no matter how successful the organization. Because the business organizations in this study were, by and large, "successful" companies, one would expect managers in these organizations to report higher satisfaction with pay than their counterparts in commonweal

organizations. A future study might examine this success factor by using organizations which are not quite as successful as the organizations in this study. In addition, the Amount of Work may reflect a business organization's ability to staff more efficiently than a commonweal organization.

Company Identification was predicted to be greater for commonweal organizations than for business organizations. It was believed that a major reason for employment in a commonweal organization was a strong identification with public service. The results indicated the opposite was true. This outcome suggests that managers who work for the business type organizations identified more strongly with their company's profit-oriented mission than did the commonweal managers with their organization's public-service mission. One possible explanation for this outcome is that this study was conducted during good economic conditions. During bad economic conditions, managers in business organizations may be less secure in their jobs and report lower job satisfaction while managers in commonweal organizations may be more secure in their jobs and report higher job satisfaction. This outcome was also predicted by Deci's (1972) study of dissonance theory. Managers in business organizations may not have been satisfied with the

intangible aspects of their work and therefore may have expressed greater satisfaction with a more tangible aspect (i.e., the profit orientation).

The third Hypothesis predicting a significant interaction effect was not supported. Some interactions were observed for the scales of Pay, Career Future, and Kind of Work, however the interactions were not significant. In addition, the pattern of means across variables was not consistent. The fact that they were not consistent might merit future study.

A principle components analysis procedure was utilized to identify any correlations that may exist between the scales of the IOR. The results of the factor analysis procedure identified two independent factors - Factor 1 and Factor 2. These two factors were labeled "Intangible" and "Tangible" respectively. Intangible factors relate to those items that are more difficult to quantify while tangible factors relate to those items that are more substantial and quantifiable. The scales of Co-Workers, Supervision, and Kind of Work loaded on the first factor while the scales of Pay and Amount of Work loaded on the second factor. This procedure partially validated the original three hypotheses in that it confirmed the predicted groupings of the five scales.

In partial support of Hypothesis 1, the subsequent ANOVA procedure showed significant differences for Factor 1 (Intangible) for organization structure. Managers in the flat structured organizations were significantly more satisfied with these "intangible" aspects of their work than were their counterparts in the tall structured organizations. As stated earlier in this discussion, the flat structure may provide higher quality interactions with immediate superiors and co-workers and more frequent interaction with upper management. All of this may lead to greater satisfaction with these aspects of a manager's job. No significant differences were found for Factor 1 for organization type. This concurred with the earlier results.

In partial support of Hypothesis 2, a subsequent ANOVA procedure showed significant differences for Factor 2 for organization type. Managers in business organizations were significantly more satisfied with the "tangible" aspects of their work than were their counterparts in commonweal organizations. As mentioned earlier, the success of the business organizations used in this study may have affected the scores on Factor 2. No significant differences were found for Factor 2 for organization structure.

Finally, the ANOVA procedure showed no significant interaction effect for Factor 1 or for Factor 2. Once

again, some interactions were observed for each factor but none were significant.

The results of this study must be viewed in light of several limitations. First, the following factors may have possibly clouded the results: (1) the experience level of the managers. Differences in the length of time each manager has spent in their job or with the organization may account for differences in reporting of job satisfaction; (2) the salary level of the managers. Salary level was not held constant across respondents. While no organization in this study was known for abnormally low salary levels, varying levels of salary and benefits may have skewed the results in one direction or the other; (3) the prevailing economic conditions at the time of the study; (4) the total size of the organization. This may be true even though size was accounted for when categorizing organizations as flat or tall. Other factors which may have affected the results are: whether managers were in operations or staff positions, headquarters or field positions; office space; and other environmental conditions such as building size and age, proximity to the home, etc.

An additional factor which was not investigated in this study was the issue of personal values and their congruity with organizational values in relation to job

satisfaction. Mount and Muchinsky (1978) found that employees were more satisfied with their jobs when their personal values were congruent with the organization's values. A future study might investigate organization structure and job satisfaction of managers whose personal values are congruent with the organization's values.

The results of this study suggested that structural and functional characteristics of organizations, such as tall/flat and business/commonweal, might have an impact on managers' satisfaction with their jobs. There were significant main effects for organization structure, with managers in flat-structured organizations more satisfied with their Supervision, Co-Workers, and Kind of Work than managers in tall-structured organizations. Managers in business-type organizations were significantly more satisfied with their Pay, Amount of Work, and Company Identification than were managers in commonweal-type organizations. Because two of the three hypotheses were partially supported, it seems valuable to pursue this topic further. A significant interaction effect may even result if this study were repeated in a more controlled environment. It is suggested, therefore, that further studies be conducted within a single organization. Various subunits within the organization could be examined and characterized as tall or

flat, business or commonweal.

In summary, the overall conclusion of this study is that organizational characteristics such as structure and function may significantly impact a manager's job satisfaction. Because job satisfaction of managers is a major contributor to success of any organization, further research on this topic is certainly warranted.

APPENDIX A

Organizations Classified According to Blau-Scott Typology

Mutual Benefit

- County medical association
- Farm cooperative
- Labor union
- Religious/fraternal organization

Business

- Bank
- Manufacturing plant
- Newspaper
- Retail store
- Railroad

Service

- Civil Rights organization
- Public school system
- University
- Insurance company

Commonweal

- City recreation department
- Public television station
- State hospital
- Law-enforcement agency

APPENDIX B

Organization Structure

<u>Size *</u>	<u>Number of Managerial Levels**</u>	<u>Structure</u>
1-500	1, 2, or 3 4, 5, 6, or greater	Flat Tall
500-1,000	1, 2, 3, or 4 5, 6, 7, or greater	Flat Tall
1,000-5,000	1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 6, 7, 8, or greater	Flat Tall
> 5,000	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 7, 8, 9, or greater	Flat Tall

* Total number of employees in organization

** Total number of managerial levels in organization

Adapted from Porter and Lawler, "The Effects of Tall versus Flat Organization Structure on Managerial Job Satisfaction", Personnel Psychology, 1964, 135-149.

APPENDIX C

Index of Organizational Reaction

1 _____	3 _____
2 _____	4 _____

PLACE AN "X" BEFORE THE ONE RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR FEELING OR OPINION

1. The people who supervise me have:
 - _____ 1. Many more good habits than bad
 - _____ 2. More good habits than bad
 - _____ 3. Same number of good and bad work habits
 - _____ 4. More bad habits than good
 - _____ 5. Many more bad habits than good
2. The supervision I receive is the kind that:
 - _____ 1. Greatly discourages me from giving extra effort
 - _____ 2. Tends to discourage me from giving extra effort
 - _____ 3. Has little influence on me
 - _____ 4. Encourages me to give extra effort
 - _____ 5. Greatly encourages me to give extra effort
3. How does the way you are treated by those who supervise you influence your overall attitude toward your job?
 - _____ 1. It has a very unfavorable influence
 - _____ 2. It has a slightly unfavorable influence
 - _____ 3. It has no real effect
 - _____ 4. It has a favorable influence
 - _____ 5. It has a very favorable influence
4. How much do your supervisors add to the success of your unit?
 - _____ 1. A very great deal
 - _____ 2. Quite a bit
 - _____ 3. Only a little
 - _____ 4. Very little
 - _____ 5. Almost nothing
5. How do you feel about the supervision you receive?
 - _____ 1. I am extremely satisfied
 - _____ 2. I am well satisfied
 - _____ 3. I am only moderately satisfied
 - _____ 4. I am somewhat dissatisfied
 - _____ 5. I am very dissatisfied
6. Do you ever have the feeling you would be better off working under different supervision?
 - _____ 1. I almost always feel this way
 - _____ 2. I frequently feel this way
 - _____ 3. I occasionally feel this way
 - _____ 4. I seldom feel this way
 - _____ 5. I never feel this way
7. How much of the work you do stirs up real enthusiasm on your part?
 - _____ 1. Nearly all of it
 - _____ 2. More than half of it
 - _____ 3. About half of it
 - _____ 4. Less than half of it
 - _____ 5. Almost none of it
8. How many of the things you do on your job do you enjoy?
 - _____ 1. Nearly all
 - _____ 2. More than half
 - _____ 3. About half
 - _____ 4. Less than half
 - _____ 5. Almost none
9. How does the kind of work you do influence your overall attitude toward your job?
 - _____ 1. It has a very unfavorable influence
 - _____ 2. It has a slightly unfavorable influence
 - _____ 3. It has no influence one way or the other
 - _____ 4. It has a fairly favorable influence
 - _____ 5. It has a very favorable influence
10. How do you feel about the kind of work you do?
 - _____ 1. Don't like it, would prefer some other kind of work
 - _____ 2. It's OK, there's other work I like better
 - _____ 3. I like it, but there is other work I like as much
 - _____ 4. I like it very much
 - _____ 5. It's exactly the kind of work I like best
11. How often when you finish a day's work do you feel you've accomplished something really worthwhile?
 - _____ 1. All of the time
 - _____ 2. Most of the time
 - _____ 3. About half of the time
 - _____ 4. Less than half of the time
 - _____ 5. Rarely
12. Work like mine:
 - _____ 1. Discourages me from doing my best
 - _____ 2. Tends to discourage me from doing my best
 - _____ 3. Makes little difference
 - _____ 4. Slightly encourages me to do my best
 - _____ 5. Greatly encourages me to do my best

13. I feel my workload is:
- ☐ 1. Never too heavy
 - ☐ 2. Seldom too heavy
 - ☐ 3. Sometimes too heavy
 - ☐ 4. Often too heavy
 - ☐ 5. Almost always too heavy
14. How do you feel about the amount of work you're expected to do?
- ☐ 1. Very dissatisfied
 - ☐ 2. Somewhat dissatisfied
 - ☐ 3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 - ☐ 4. Somewhat satisfied
 - ☐ 5. Very satisfied
15. How does the amount of work you're expected to do influence your overall attitude toward your job?
- ☐ 1. It has a very favorable influence
 - ☐ 2. It has a favorable influence
 - ☐ 3. It has no influence one way or the other
 - ☐ 4. It has an unfavorable influence
 - ☐ 5. It has a very unfavorable influence
16. How does the amount of work you're expected to do influence the way you do your job?
- ☐ 1. It never allows me to do a good job
 - ☐ 2. It seldom allows me to do a good job
 - ☐ 3. It has no effect on how I do my job
 - ☐ 4. It usually allows me to do a good job
 - ☐ 5. It always allows me to do a good job
17. How do you generally feel about the employees you work with?
- ☐ 1. They are the best group I could ask for
 - ☐ 2. I like them a great deal
 - ☐ 3. I like them fairly well
 - ☐ 4. I have no feeling one way or the other
 - ☐ 5. I don't particularly care for them
18. How is your overall attitude toward your job influenced by the people you work with?
- ☐ 1. It is very favorably influenced
 - ☐ 2. It is favorably influenced
 - ☐ 3. It is not influenced one way or the other
 - ☐ 4. It is unfavorably influenced
 - ☐ 5. It is very unfavorably influenced
19. The example my fellow employees set:
- ☐ 1. Greatly discourages me from working hard
 - ☐ 2. Somewhat discourages me from working hard
 - ☐ 3. Has little effect on me
 - ☐ 4. Somewhat encourages me to work hard
 - ☐ 5. Greatly encourages me to work hard
20. How much does the way co-workers handle their jobs add to the success of your unit?
- ☐ 1. It adds almost nothing
 - ☐ 2. It adds very little
 - ☐ 3. It adds only a little
 - ☐ 4. It adds quite a bit
 - ☐ 5. It adds a very great deal
21. In this unit, there is:
- ☐ 1. A very great deal of friction
 - ☐ 2. Quite a bit of friction
 - ☐ 3. Some friction
 - ☐ 4. Little friction
 - ☐ 5. Almost no friction
22. How does the amount of money you now make influence your overall attitude toward you job?
- ☐ 1. It has a very favorable influence
 - ☐ 2. It has a fairly favorable influence
 - ☐ 3. It has no influence one way or the other
 - ☐ 4. It has a slightly unfavorable influence
 - ☐ 5. It has a very unfavorable influence
23. Does the way pay is handled around here make it worthwhile for a person to work especially hard?
- ☐ 1. It definitely encourages hard work
 - ☐ 2. It tends to encourage hard work
 - ☐ 3. It makes little difference
 - ☐ 4. It tends to discourage hard work
 - ☐ 5. It definitely discourages hard work
24. Considering what it costs to live in this area, my pay is:
- ☐ 1. Very inadequate
 - ☐ 2. Inadequate
 - ☐ 3. Barely adequate
 - ☐ 4. Adequate
 - ☐ 5. More than adequate

25. To what extent are your needs satisfied by the pay and benefits you receive?
- ☐ 1. Almost none of my needs are satisfied
 - ☐ 2. Very few of my needs are satisfied
 - ☐ 3. A few of my needs are satisfied
 - ☐ 4. Many of my needs are satisfied
 - ☐ 5. Almost all of my needs are satisfied
26. For the job I do, I feel the amount of money I make is:
- ☐ 1. Extremely good
 - ☐ 2. Good
 - ☐ 3. Neither good nor poor
 - ☐ 4. Fairly poor
 - ☐ 5. Very poor
27. How much pride can you take in the appearance of your unit?
- ☐ 1. A very great deal
 - ☐ 2. Quite a bit
 - ☐ 3. Some
 - ☐ 4. Little
 - ☐ 5. Very little
28. How do you feel about your physical working conditions?
- ☐ 1. Extremely satisfied
 - ☐ 2. Well satisfied
 - ☐ 3. Only moderately satisfied
 - ☐ 4. Somewhat dissatisfied
 - ☐ 5. Very dissatisfied
29. For the work I do, my physical working conditions are:
- ☐ 1. Very poor
 - ☐ 2. Relatively poor
 - ☐ 3. Neither good nor poor
 - ☐ 4. Reasonably good
 - ☐ 5. Very good
30. How do your physical working conditions influence your overall attitude toward your job?
- ☐ 1. They have a very unfavorable influence
 - ☐ 2. They have a slightly unfavorable influence
 - ☐ 3. They have no influence one way or the other
 - ☐ 4. They have a favorable influence
 - ☐ 5. They have a very favorable influence
31. The physical working conditions make working here:
- ☐ 1. Very unpleasant
 - ☐ 2. Unpleasant
 - ☐ 3. Neither pleasant nor unpleasant
 - ☐ 4. Pleasant
 - ☐ 5. Very pleasant
32. How do your physical working conditions affect the way you do your job?
- ☐ 1. They help me a great deal
 - ☐ 2. They help a little
 - ☐ 3. They make little difference
 - ☐ 4. They tend to make it difficult
 - ☐ 5. They make it very difficult
33. How do your feelings about your future with the company influence your overall attitude toward your job?
- ☐ 1. They have a very favorable influence
 - ☐ 2. They have a favorable influence
 - ☐ 3. They have no influence one way or the other
 - ☐ 4. They have a slightly unfavorable influence
 - ☐ 5. They have a very unfavorable influence
34. How do you feel about your future with the company?
- ☐ 1. I am very worried about it
 - ☐ 2. I am somewhat worried about it
 - ☐ 3. I have mixed feelings about it
 - ☐ 4. I feel good about it
 - ☐ 5. I feel very good about it
35. The way my future with the company looks to me now:
- ☐ 1. Hard work seems very worthwhile
 - ☐ 2. Hard work seems fairly worthwhile
 - ☐ 3. Hard work seems worthwhile
 - ☐ 4. Hard work hardly seems worthwhile
 - ☐ 5. Hard work seems almost worthless
36. Do you feel you are getting ahead in the company?
- ☐ 1. I'm making a great deal of progress
 - ☐ 2. I'm making some progress
 - ☐ 3. I'm not sure
 - ☐ 4. I'm making very little progress
 - ☐ 5. I'm making no progress

37. How secure are you in your present job?

- ☐ 1. I feel very uneasy about it
- ☐ 2. I feel fairly uneasy about it
- ☐ 3. I feel somewhat uneasy about it
- ☐ 4. I feel fairly sure of it
- ☐ 5. I feel very sure of it

38. I think this company considers employees:

- ☐ 1. Much less important than sales and profits
- ☐ 2. Less important than sales and profits
- ☐ 3. About as important as sales and profits
- ☐ 4. More important than sales and profits
- ☐ 5. Much more important than sales and profits

39. How do you describe the company as a company to work for?

- ☐ 1. Couldn't be much better
- ☐ 2. Very good
- ☐ 3. Fairly good
- ☐ 4. Just another place to work
- ☐ 5. Poor

40. How does working for this company influence your overall attitude toward your job?

- ☐ 1. It has a very unfavorable influence
- ☐ 2. It has an unfavorable influence
- ☐ 3. It has no influence one way or the other
- ☐ 4. It has a favorable influence
- ☐ 5. It has a very favorable influence

41. From my experience, I feel this company probably treats its employees:

- ☐ 1. Poorly
- ☐ 2. Somewhat poorly
- ☐ 3. Fairly well
- ☐ 4. Quite well
- ☐ 5. Extremely well

42. There is something about working for this company that:

- ☐ 1. Greatly encourages me to do my best
- ☐ 2. Definitely encourages me to do my best
- ☐ 3. Only slightly encourages me to do my best
- ☐ 4. Tends to discourage me from doing my best
- ☐ 5. Definitely discourages me from doing my best

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Dear Respondent,

The following questionnaire is part of a current Masters thesis study being conducted at the University of Central Florida. The purpose of the study is to examine job satisfaction of managerial personnel in different types of organizations throughout the area.

The survey itself, the Index of Organizational Reactions, consists of 42 multiple-choice items that cover all facets of the work environment. Please try to respond to every item. If an item is non-applicable, please indicate so by writing (NA) next to the question.

A copy of the final results of the study will be sent to each participating organization when complete sometime in Let me emphasize that respondents will remain completely anonymous. Indicate only your position title at the top of the survey. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me at the University Psychology Department. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Robert Adams

REFERENCES

- Alder, Craig. (1978). Relation of structure to satisfaction, stress, and performance among athletic directors in senior colleges of NCAA. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38,80-A. 4461.
- Blau, P.M., & Scott, W.R. (1962). Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Carpenter, H.H. (1970). The relationship between certain organizational structure factors and perceived needs satisfaction of classroom teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 9-A. 3666-3667.
- Carpenter, H.H. (1971). Formal organizational structural factors and perceived job satisfaction of classroom teachers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 460-465.
- Cummings, L.L., & Berger, C.J. (1977). Organization structure: How does it influence attitudes and performance? Management Review, 66, 40-43.
- Deci, E.L. (1972). Effects of contingent and noncontingent rewards and controls on intrinsic motivation. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 217-229.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Filley, A.C., & Aldag, R.J. (1978). Characteristics and measurement of an organizational typology. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 578-591.
- Ghiselli, E., & Johnson, D. (1970). Need satisfaction, managerial success, and organizational structure. Personnel Psychology, 23 (4), 569-576.
- Indik, B.P. (1968). The scope of the problem and some suggestions toward a solution. In B.P. Indik and F.K. Berrien. People, groups, and organizations. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Ivancevich, J., & Donnely, J. (1975). Effects of organization structure on job satisfaction. Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 272-280.
- James, L.R., & Jones, A.P. (1976). Organizational structure: A review of structural dimensions and their conceptual relationships with individual attitudes and behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 74-113.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2 ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Kimberly, J.R. (1976). Organizational size and the structuralist perspective: A review, critique, and proposal, Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 571-597.
- Litwak, E. (1961). Models of bureaucracy which permit conflict. American Journal of Sociology, 67, 177-184.
- Meltzer, L., & Salter, J. (1962). Organizational structure and the performance and job satisfaction of physiologists. American Sociological Review, 27, 351-362.
- Meyer, M.W. (1977). Theory of organizational structure. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Mount, M.K., & Muchinsky, P.M. (1978). Person-Environment congruence and employee job satisfaction: A test of Holland's theory. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 13, 84-100.
- Parsons, T. (1960). Structure and process in modern society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Perrow, C.A. (1967). A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. American Sociological Review, 32, 194-208.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. (1964). The effects of tall versus flat organization structures on managerial job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 17, 135-148.

- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. (1965). Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitudes and job behavior. Psychology Bulletin, 64, 23-51.
- Porter, L.W., & Siegel, J. (1965). Relationships of tall and flat organization structures to the satisfaction of foreign managers. Personnel Psychology, 18, 379-392.
- Pugh, D.S., & Hickson, D.F.; Hinings, C.R.; Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of Organization Structure. Administrative Science Quarterly, 13, 65-105.
- Richardson, F.L.W., & Walker, C.R. (1948). Human relations in an expanding company. New Haven, CT: Labor and Management Center, Yale University.
- Sells, S.B. (1963). An interactionist looks at the environment. American Psychologist, 18, 696-702.
- Wesolowski, Z.P. (1970). Organizational structure and morale. SAM Advanced Management Journal, 35, 50-54.
- Woodward, J. (1958). Management and technology. London: H.M. Stationary Office.
- Worthy, J.C. (1950). Organizational structure and employee morale. American Sociological Review, 15, 169-179.
- Worthy, J.C. (1959). Big business and free man. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.